



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,282	04/14/2004	Mark L. Roth	5681-75900	6128
58467	7590	11/14/2007		
MHKKG/SUN P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767			EXAMINER CHAUHAN, LOREN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,282

Applicant(s)

ROTH, MARK L.

Examiner

Loren Chauhan

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/3/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-36 are pending for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 19, 24-25, 28, 30 and 35-36 are objected to because of the following informalities: Examiner notes the use of "API, PDF, HTML and TLD" acronyms in above claims. Use of acronyms in claim language should be explained in plain text. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 15-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:
 - i. As per claim 15, lines 1, it is not clearly understood what the method is for? (i.e. a method of automatically generating documentation from plurality of source files). Lines 2-5, it is uncertain who is receiving information from multiple sources (i.e. documentation tool?). Line 3-5, it is

not properly explain who is extracting, aggregating and transforming documentation data?

- ii. As per claim 26, it is a computer readable medium claim of claim 15, therefore; it is rejected for the same reason as per claim 15 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5, 12-20, 23-31 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (US PG-PUB. No. 2002/0059348).

7. As per claim 1, Lee teaches the invention as claimed including a system, comprising:

a processor (102, fig. 1A); and

memory coupled to the processor and configured to store program instructions executable by the processor to implement a software documentation generator configured to (page 1, [0016]):

input a plurality of sources (page 1, [0017] lines 13-15);

analyze the one or more sources to identify a type of each of the sources (page

5, [0063] lines 11-12; page [0020]);

extract information from the plurality of sources based on the type of the source

(page 5, [0063] lines 13-16; page 2 [0021]);

aggregate the extracted information into a uniform format (page 3 [0033]); and

transform the aggregated information into one or more specified sets of software

documentation (page 4, [0051] lines 1-4).

8. As per claim 2, Lee teaches the system, wherein one of the sources comprises a software library documentation file (page 1, [0008] lines 1-4).

9. As per claim 3, Lee teaches the system, wherein the software library documentation file comprises a tag library descriptor (TLD) (page 1 [0008] lines 1-4).

10. As per claim 4, Lee teaches the system, wherein one of the sources comprises application source code (page 1, [0017]).

11. As per claim 5, Lee teaches the system, wherein the documentation sets comprise documentation for one or more application programming interfaces (API) provided by a software library (page 1 [0008] lines 1-4).

Art Unit: 2193

12. As per claim 12, Lee teaches the system, wherein the output software documentation sets comprise one or more text files (page 4 [0051] lines 1-4).

13. As per claim 13, Lee teaches the system, wherein the output software documentation sets comprises one or more portable document files (PDF) (page 4 [0051] lines 1-4).

14. As per claim 14, Lee teaches the system, wherein the output software documentation sets comprise one or more hypertext markup language (HTML) files (page 4, [0051] lines 1-4).

15. As per claims 15-19 and 26-30, they are the method and computer accessible medium claims of claims 1-5, therefore; they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 1-5 above.

16. As per claims 20 and 31, Lee teaches the method, wherein said extracting comprises: analyzing a source for type and data format; and selecting a corresponding input source based on said analyzing (page 2 [0021]).

Art Unit: 2193

17. As per claims 23-25 and 34-36, they are the method and computer accessible medium claims of claims 12-14, therefore; they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 12-14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claim 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US PG-PUB. No. 2002/0059348) in view of Lorenz (US Pat. No 6,405,366).

20. As per claim 6, Lee teaches the system, wherein the software documentation generator is configured to include each input source is configured to extract information from source files of types to which it corresponds (page 2 [0020], [0021]).

21. Lee does not explicitly teach, one or more input source plug-ins, wherein each input source plug-in corresponds to one or more of the source file types.

Art Unit: 2193

22. Lorenz teaches one or more source plug-ins, wherein each input source plug-in corresponds to one or more of the source file types (page 8, lines 29-30).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the plug ins for different data sources taught by Lorenz in Lee's system so that Lee's system can operate on variety of source files originating from different types of sources.

24. As per claim 7, Lee teaches the method, wherein an input source plug-in is configured to generate information not included in the corresponding source file (page 2 [0020] lines 6-10).

25. As per claim 8, Lee teaches the method, wherein each input source plug-in is configured to output data in the uniform aggregate format (page 3 [0033]).

26. Claim 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US PG-PUB. No. 2002/0059348) in view of Lorenz (US Pat. No 6,405,366) and further in view of Stern (US Pat. No. 6,507,855).

27. As per claim 9, Lee and Lorenzo does not explicitly teach the system, wherein the software documentation generator is configured to include one or more transformer

Art Unit: 2193

plug-in sets, wherein each transformer plug-in set corresponds to one or more types of output software documentation sets and each transformer plug-in set is configured to generate one or more output software documentation sets of types to which the plug-in corresponds.

28. Stern teaches the system wherein the software documentation generator is configured to include one or more transformer sets, wherein each transformer set corresponds to one or more types of output software documentation sets and each transformer set is configured to generate one or more output software documentation sets of types to which it corresponds (col. 2, lines 58-62; col. 3, lines 48-50).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include transformer sets taught by Stern in Lee and Lorenzo's system so that programmer can choose any programming environment for generating code and inputting corresponding documentation that sufficiently describe the code (Stern col. 2, lines 43-48).

30. As per claim 10, Stern teaches the method, wherein the input source plug-ins are configured to produce a uniformly formatted aggregate input document and wherein each transformer plug-in set is configured to input data included in the uniformly formatted aggregate input document (col. 3, lines 48-50, 56-61).

Art Unit: 2193

31. As per claim 11, Lee teaches the method, wherein a transformer plug-in set is configured to generate information not included in the uniformly formatted aggregate input document (page 3 [0033]).

32. Claim 21-22 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US PG-PUB. No. 2002/0059348) in view of Stern (US Pat. No. 6,507,855).

33. As per claim 21, Lee teaches the method, wherein said aggregating comprises: if a uniformly formatted aggregate input document specifies information not comprised in data extracted from the source, generating said information (page 2 [0024]); but fails to teach generating a uniformly formatted aggregate input document.

34. Stern teaches generating a uniformly formatted aggregate input document (108 fig. 1).

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include uniformly formatted input document as taught by Stern in Lee so that the system can automatically generate documentation directly from the generated code and corresponding documentation input (Stern col. 2, lines 47-48).

Art Unit: 2193

36. As per claim 22, Lee teaches the method, wherein said transforming comprises: translating a portion of a uniformly formatted aggregate input document into one or more elements of a software documentation set in the specified output documentation format (page [0035], [0036], [0037]); but does not teach selecting a transformer plug-in set corresponding to a specified output documentation format.

37. Stern teaches selecting a transformer set corresponding to a specified output documentation format (col. 3, lines 56-61).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to uniformly formatted input document as taught by Stern in Lee so that the system can automatically generate documentation directly from the generated code and corresponding documentation input (Stern col. 2, lines 47-48).

39. As per claims 32-33, they are the computer accessible medium claims of claims 21-22, therefore; they are rejected for the same reason as per claims 21-22.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Loren Chauhan whose telephone number is 571-270-1554. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thr. 9:30-5:00 (EST).

Art Unit: 2193

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Loren Chauhan
Examiner
Art Unit 2193

lc


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100